THE ADVOCATE

&c.

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; February, 1838. No. 10

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND ITS ORDER.

"And they (*the Baptized Believers of the Gospel*) continued stedfast in the teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in the prayers of the Apostles."—*Acts* ii, 42.

The true Christian worship is alone divine; because, it alone of all worships extant was divinely appointed. The word is used to signify those acts, either in the aggregate or detail by which men draw near to God. Hence there are as many kinds of worship as there are sects among mankind; each sect has its own worship and order thereof. But worship is homage paid to the Supreme, with whom mankind is not on terms of friendship. *Man has offended God;* reason, therefore, teaches that *it is the prerogative of the Most High to dictate to men in what way they may approach his Majesty.* The first Pair when *shame and fear*, the certain signs of guilt, invaded their consciences, thought to hide their own nakedness by raiment of their own contrivance. But the Lord God rejected it. He clothed them according to his own mind, and appointed them the skins of sacrifices instead of the bloodless foliage of the tree. When they entered his presence clothed with their own device they were judged and condemned; but when wrapped in apparel of his appointment we find them walking in the favor of God; as in the case of Abel. Cain is an example of the light in which God views the worship of men, when not according to his appointment. "Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering."—And it may be asked, why?—Because, it was worship according to the Lord's appointment.—"Cain brought of the fruit of the ground a (bloodless) offering to the Lord."—"But unto Cain and his offering he had not respect."—And why?—Because, it was not according to appointment. God had not required it at his hand. He had neglected to do the right thing; and therefore, he was a doer of evil: for the essence of evil-doing is not to do what God requires us to do. Cain's offering was an abomination in his sight; therefore, he had no respect to it. "The sa-

crifice of the wicked is an abomination to God."—"If thou doest well, O Cain, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.

If a general invade a country and subdue its inhabitants, does he permit them to determine the homage or worship they will yield? Does he not rather appoint the homage himself, and exact it upon pain of his sore displeasure? If he were to require of them two million of dollars *in specie* per annum, would he be content, if they were to lay at his feet worn out notes to that nominal amount? They might urge, that they thought that these would do; bu' would the general admit their *thinkso* as an equivalent to an actual obedience to his edict?—Reason and history testify, that such a principle has no place in the affairs of victors and the vanquished. Neither will God admit it; as all his dealings with men attest. His King is the mighty hero, whose laws will be made victorious. 'Tis he that will give laws to the Nations; it is they who must obey or be exterminated.

Cain and Abel are the types, as it were, of "the Sons of Men" and "the Sons of God." The Sons of Men are the genuine anti-types of Cain. Like Cain, they acknowledge that offerings should be made to God; and like him, they claim the right of choosing their own ways or worship. The Cainites are an erring, headstrong, disobedient, and presumptuous class of men. They pass under the names of Atheist, Deist, Infidel, Catholic, Protestant, Mohammedan, Jew, and Pagan. They all worship something they call God, according to their own appointments, and in their own order. They are a stiff-necked and perverse generation. They are willing to do any thing, but the right thing: and this they will excuse themselves from doing by every conceivable subterfuge or evasion. The Abelites, on the other hand, require only to know what God commands, and straightway to do it. This is the very essence of doing well.

There is this essential difference then, between the worship of the Sons of God, and the worship of the Cainites;—the former worship God according to his appointments; which is, therefore, a worship in spirit and truth, or divine: while the latter worship according to their own devices, which is therefore, "will-worship," or human. As to the Sons of God, it is written,—"the Father requires such to worship him," and to the Cainites the Scripture saith, "in vain do ye worship me teaching for doctrine the traditions of men."

The homage or worship which God requires of men under this Dispensation is twofold; *first*, as regards sinners; and *second*, as respects the Saints. He does not ask sinners to perform the adoration of the Saints, *until they cease to be sinners*. These two classes of men in the sight of God are as different or distinct, and as far removed as darkness and light, error and

truth, disobedience and obedience, rebels and subjects, idolaters and true worshippers. The worship, which he requires sinners to perform is *to obey the Gospel.* Until they do this they are in an unreconciled state toward God. There is but one way in which they can be reconciled. God is reconciled to them, and has appointed the way by which they may become reconciled to him. He has provided the means of reconciliation. A belief of and obedience to the Gospel is the means. If they will not believe and obey the Gospel the consequence will be fatal, and they will have only themselves to blame.—The Gospel stands between them and God; if they would worship him acceptably they must obey the Gospel. Let them not deceive themselves. God is not to be mocked; he cannot deny himself. Their prayers, songs, alms-deeds, &c., are sacrifices in which as coming from them he takes no delight. The blind Jew, whom Jesus restored to sight, has stated this truth in few and appropriate terms, to the confusion of all the hierarchies of Anti-christ who teach the contrary;—"we know," said he, "that God hears not sinners; but if any man worship God, *and obey him*, that man he hears." Transgressor! be no longer deceived by the pretended "Ministers of Christ" who ravin among you like wolves in sheep's clothing. They tell you to go up to their altars, that they may pray for you. Their altars are no altars at all Their prayers are of no virtue. They are sinners like yourselves, whose supplications are false and abominable in his sight. They are deceivers and deceived. They neither know the truth themselves nor have they obeyed it; if they do know the truth, so much the worse for them if they obey it not. They are blind, leaders of the blind; and you know if the blind lead the blind *both* will fall into the ditch.—They and you may be *sincerely* blind; but remember if you approach the edge of the ditch your sincerity cannot save you from falling in: nothing but sight can deliver you. So if you travel on to the grave in mental blindness you will fall into perdition; unless the truth give sight to your mental eyes before it be too late.

The Saints, under this dispensation, are those, and only those, who have obeyed the Gospel. A Saint is a baptized believer of the Gospel. The term signifies *a holy one.* The Holy One is Jesus; the holy ones are his genuine disciples.—There are no such things as Saints, who believe that Jesus is the Christ, repent, *and fall short of actual obedience to the Gospel.* If there be in the world other persons called Saints, they must be spurious, for there are no such Saints spoken of in the New Testament. There are Catholic Saints and Protestant Saints, but these are not the Saints in Christ Jesus.—For any one to be a Saint in Christ, he must enter *into* him; and there is no way of doing this save and except by being buried with him in baptism.

The Saints, then, or baptized believers of the Gospel, standing in a different relation to God than the unholy, have a different worship to observe suited to their state and character.—This worship is composed of the institutions enumerated in the passage prefixed to this article. The continuing stedfast in the teaching, fellowship, breaking of the loaf, and prayers of the Apostles, implies, that the disciples not only witnessed the performance of these acts, but did in very deed participate in them. They heard, believed, and practiced the teaching of the Apostles; they sold their estates and laid the produce at the Apostles' feet, that the Apostles might distribute to the necessities of all the Saints; they eat of the loaf which the Apostles broke; and they with heart and mind added their "Amen" to the Apostles' prayers. All these things were "of the Apostles," because, they taught the Saints to observe these, and themselves personally administered them.

But some may say if these be the sum and substance, the part and the whole, of the worship of the Saints; how is it that even we who contend only for what is written practice, exhortation, singing, giving of thanks, and drinking of wine? seeing that no mention is made of these things in Acts ii. 42.—To this we would reply;—that the four things mentioned in this verse are *four institutions*, which are themselves made up of component parts. The institution of Apostolic teaching comprehends *prophesying* or "the speaking to men for edification, and exhortation, and consolation" as well as teaching;—the institution of the Fellowship comprehends the providing of all things necessary for the wants of the Body of Christ;—the institution of the Breaking of the Loaf comprehends the giving of thanks for the true bread which came down from heaven, &c; the pouring out of the Wine; the giving of thanks for what it represents; the partaking of the bread and wine by all the Saints; and *the hymning of the praises* as well as the breaking the loaf;—and the institution of the Prayers comprehends "supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings" as well as prayers; to all of which the Believers said "Amen."

As to the Order of this Divine Worship a few words may be added. It is one of the attributes of a good historian to narrate events in the order of their occurrence. Luke wrote under the guidance of one who was perfect in this respect as in all others. Luke's experience of the congregations was complete. He was well acquainted with their faith and practice in all their parts. What more probable then, but that he would in writing an account of their acts of assembly record their transactions in the order in which they uniformly took place. Even supposing, that the order as set down historically in Acts ii. 42, were only probable, is there extant among us an order of worship amounting even to a probability? The order observed in the Churches of "this reformation" as far as

I know, with one or two exceptions, has no counterpart in the New Testament. The elders follow their own views. Hence in one Church, the worship begins with prayers, in another with singing, in a third with reading, and so forth; so that, there is an entire want of uniformity. Some object to the order as exhibited in Acts ii. 42, and contend that the worship ought to commence with prayers; because, say they, Paul says, "I exhort *first of all* that supplications, prayers, &c be made;" and yet they are inconsistent enough to *sing* "first of all;" so that we can but regard their objection as puerile and wanton. They cannot certainly believe that there is any force in their argument, or, if honest, they would assuredly follow out their convictions. Will these objectors prove that Paul's meaning is "I exhort, that when you come together on the Lord's Day, the first thing of all others you do is to pray?"—To me, it appears, that, when he said "I exhort, first of all, he meant I exhort *especially*, that when you pray, you make intercessions, prayers, and supplications for kings, and all who are in authority, &c" if he meant first of all in order, why has he not said what is to be done, second or third, or fourth of all?—For my own part, I always prefer *that which is more evident to that which is less so;* now there is more evidence for the order of Acts ii 42, than for the ever-varying course of the Churches called "Reformed." I prefer, therefore, to follow it, and whenever I have opportunity to recommend it as worthy of all reception.

A place for every thing, and for every thing a place. In the first place, then, THE TEACHING. The Holy Spirit being the Teacher of the Saints, and the Apostolic and prophetic writings containing all that can edify, console, and instruct, being the fruits of his inspiration, the Scriptures should be first examined by reading and collation as the opening of the service. The acquisition of knowledge, which is light, should always precede action of any kind, more especially that which relates to God. A congregation of worshippers in which the Scriptures have little or no place is a chamber of darkness. The prophetic word is the light which shines in a dark place to which we do well to take heed. Without the light of the seven-branched-golden candlestick in the Holy Place the Priests could not have performed the Divine Service under the Law; so without the light of the Holy Spirit shining from the sacred page would the congregation of the kings and priests to God be unable acceptably to worship him. The first thing then, to be done, when they meet for the service on the Lord's Day is to light up the brilliants by attending to the Teaching, that their beams may shine into the hearts of the worshippers.

In the second place THE FELLOWSHIP.—"On the first day of every week let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the Treasury"—Eve-

ry well ordered congregation of Christ has its Treasury.—Without a Treasury its widows and orphans will, if necessitous, have to depend on the world for support. Without a Treasury, it cannot sound out the word of the truth of the Gospel; and so forth. Every Saint is bound, according to his means, to contribute to the Fellowship or Treasury of the Lord. No one ought to think of eating the bread and drinking the wine before he has paid his quota towards them. A Christian ought to have more independence and a greater sense of propriety, than to set at the Lord's table at the expense of his associates. No one is so poor but that he can contribute a mite. The widow in the Scriptures is an example which puts to shame the parsimony of our money-getting and money-loving generation. She of her enury, gave all that she possessed. In this country, we have no widows whose whole living does not exceed two mites. The King's tax therefore, ought to be promptly, cheerfully, and liberally paid. And as he leaves the amount to our own discretion, we have no cause to complain.

In the third place, *take the Loaf, give thanks, break it, and then give it to the disciples.*—'The loaf, which we break, is the joint participation of the body of Christ. Because there is One Loaf, we the many (disciples not sects), are One Body; for we all participate of that one loaf.'—*Then take the cup, give thanks again, and give it also to the disciples.*—'The cup we bless is the joint participation of the blood of Christ.' "Drink this all of you:" said Jesus, "for this is (the sign of) my blood; the blood of the New Institution, shed for many, for the remission of sins."—Having drank this, *sing praises to God in Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs.* It is agreed that the Hymn sang by the Lord and his Apostles upon this occasion, consisted of the six Psalms which composed the *Great Hallel*, and which used to be sung at the Feast of the Passover, &c. There were the 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118th.—Instead of interrupting the exercises by inappropriate singing, it ought, as it appears, to me, all to be reserved for this place. After having listened to the prophetic word, having paid in our contributions, and shown forth the death of the Lord, what more appropriate than for the whole Assembly of the Saints to sing his most worthy Praises, and in poetic strains to celebrate his sufferings, his resurrection, his exaltation, his glorious coming, his triumphant reign, and so forth, "Sing also with understanding."

In conclusion, THE PRAYERS.—"Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few. A fool's voice is known by a multitude of words."—"In prayer use not a multiplicity of words as the Pagans do,

who think that using many words will gain them acceptance, imitate them not."—"If you forgive not others their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."—"Pray also with understanding."—"Having free access to the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, and having a Great High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith."—"If we walk in the light, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin. If we confess our sins, he is Faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."—"If any one have sinned we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Just One."—"If we ask any thing according to his will, he hearkens to us. And if we know that he hearkens to us concerning whatever we ask, we know that we shall obtain the petitions, which we have asked from him."—Amen!

The order of divine worship, then is,

1. The ministry of the word in teaching and 'prophesying;'
2. The Contribution to the Treasury;
3. Giving thanks for the Loaf, and eating it;
4. Giving thanks for the Wine, and drinking it;
5. Singing the Praises; and
6. The Prayers.

EDITOR.

MESSIEURS CAMPBELL, HUNNICUTT, WATT, FLIPPO, AND OTHERS.

In the February Number of the Harbinger, there is a series of documents intitled "Dr. Thomas—Again." Sundry persons figure in these, much to the gratification of Mr. Campbell, and to the *apparent* annihilation of "Dr. Thomas." When we first perused them, our eyelids widened with astonishment as we proceeded. What an alliance, thought we, have we here! Mr. Campbell, with two Clergymen, the Ministers of Antichrist, for his supporters, and he himself heralding forth their praises upon no other recommendation than their own! And against whom does he wield *their assertions?* Against one, whom he used to call his beloved brother, and published to the world as "a chosen vessel!" We know that these clerics despise him in their hearts, for, "out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh;" and from the testimony of brethren in Lunenburg, we are assured, that 'the Reverend' Mr. Home Missionary Watt, makes it a very important part of his Missionary labors to go from house to house to guard some against, and to convert others from, the damnable heresies of 'Alexander Campbell and Dr. Thomas!' As to the other 'divine,' we are informed, that since the qualification, or rather the apology for the replies to the Lunenburg Sister has appeared, he has spoken of his new patron in the west, in no very measured nor polite

terms! And why have these two 'Divines' thrown themselves into the arms of Mr. Campbell? Is it out of the love they bear him? No, the true cause is, they know that they have expired in the public esteem, and that the castigation they have severally experienced at our hand, has made them a by-word with the people; and seeing that Dr. Thomas has been set up by mistaken men as a mark to be shot at, they have availed themselves of the opportunity to gratify their revenge by shooting their poisoned shafts from Mr. Campbell's bow! We wish him much joy in his acquisition of these new Clients; for ourselves, we are forcibly reminded of the fact that when Christ was to be crucified Herod and Pontius Pilate were made friends! So when 'Dr. Thomas' is to be destroyed, 'the end justifies the means,' and a coalition is formed between two Anti-christian Clergymen and a *ci-derant* witness against their Apostacy!—Thank heaven! we are not a fourth in such a confederacy; for our own part, we would rather suffer wrong through all time than join hands in such a league.

We are informed by Mr- Campbell, that he has received a very full defence from Mr. Hunnicut of his account of our debate. The brethren in Lunenburg tell us, that they understand, that this 'very full defence' was refused a place in the Va. and N. C. Conference Journal. Mr. Campbell takes all for granted that comes from this quarter; but if Mr. Campbell really desire to know the truth of the matter, why does he not write to the Church, meeting in the Forks of Meherrin, Lunenburg, Va;—or to Mr. Joel Ragsdale, Hedge Grove, Mecklenburg, Va, or to Colonel Richardson, Barrey's Bridge, Lunenburg, Va, both Moderators at the Debate, and of Mr. Watt's own selection; or to Brethren Stone, Watts, Albert Anderson, Arvin, and numerous others of that County; or to Brethren A. B. Waithall, James M. Jeter, &c of Paineville, Amelia, who were all at the Debate? Why does he prefer taking the *ipse dixit* of two interested aliens, to the seeking the testimonies of such as we have named? If a righteous judgment were his aim he would act thus; but to gratify the pique of offended vanity, the assertion of an ill disposed local Methodist preacher outweighs a host of them! Shame, shame upon such proceeding!

Mr. Campbell goes on to tell his readers, that he has received 'a very well written,' "candid," and *he* has no doubt, a very correct view of the Hebrew part of said discussing from the pen of Mr. Watt. What does Mr. Campbell, we would ask, know of Mr. Watt's candour and veracity? Before he pronounces upon these, let him write to the Acquinton Church, King William, Va; and to Mr. William Stone, Rehoboth, Lunenburg, Va: and let Mr. Campbell inquire of them what good things they can testify to the candour and varacity of this "Presbyterian Clergyman." Let him write to Mr. Thomas Arvin of Pleasant Grove, Lunenburg, and inquire, if Mr. Watt did

not acknowledge to him that he could not write out his speeches, for he did not know what he said, or words to that effect; and let all honest men bear me witness, if during the Debate his inattention, whether feigned or real, I know not, were not most provoking; they can testify that he would turn to Dr. Thomas, and in the most lethargic tone, say "Did'nt you say so and so, Dr. Thomas? I'm sure I thought you did; but I was'nt paying much attention." When Mr. Campbell has received replies from these, then let him lay their testimony before his readers, that they also may judge whether the candour and veracity of his new ally are established beyond a doubt!

If Mr. Campbell would preserve his own 'moral reputation' with his brethren in Lunenburg, Prince Edward, Nottoway, and Amelia, the less he "puffs" about Mr. Watt's 'moral reputation' the better; we would advise Mr. Campbell as a friend, if he would not make shipwreck of his own good fame in those parts, to take care how he presents himself to the public as the champion of Mr. Watt's prowess. The public knows very well, that so far from Mr. Watt 'completely killing the Doctor at one blow,' he on the contrary, was so dispirited, that he cou'd not eke out his succeeding half-hour's speech by ten minutes! And as to his pretended criticism upon my "unfortunate blunder," it was not till the next day, although he spoke after me on the preceeding day, that, by the help of his friends, the notion came, into his head, that we said that nephesh taken *absolutely* meant "smelling bottle!" He either misunderstood me from gross inattention, or like a drowning man catching at a straw, he clung to this for the sake of ridicule. That our readers may be informed, we submit to them the following from our manuscript speeches upon the occasion alluded to, and if Mr. Campbell wish to know the truth, let him read it attentively, and refute it if he can.

DR. THOMAS' SPEECH.

My friends! On parting with my opponent the other evening, I told him, that I did not doubt, but I should make a Campbellite of him before I had done. Little did I think then, that I was so prophetic of the truth! He has publicly confessed himself to be a disciple of Mr. Alexander Campbell; for he acknowledges, that he is indebted to him for most that he has to say on the subjects in debate. Of this I have long been convinced, from the identity of their "proofs;" in his quotation of texts, &c, the disciple his faithfully followed his master! But I would say to my friend, that his case is hopeless; for if Mr. Campbell, the teacher, have failed to establish the Platonic dogma of the "immortality of the soul," I am quite sure that Mr. Watt, his pupil will not succeed!

I would ask Mr. Watt, why he is so inattentive? And why does he not reply to the things I have submitted? "Did'nt you say so and so, Dr. Thomas? I'm sure I thought you did, but I was'nt paying much attention" is the lethargic spirit with which I have to contend. He acknowledges, he has not paid as much attention as he ought to do; talks of his defective memory; and of his absence of mind, and then, without any quali-

gation, goes on to affirm "Dr. Thomas says so and so!" How can one who acts in this way, successfully defend a d prove!

Mr. Watt's religion is certainly a very militant one. The spilling of their own blood seems to be a proof of every thing, with Mr. Watt, in favor of Presbyterians! I always thought, since I learned how to think a right, that Scotch Divinity was a very combative affair. History abundantly testifies, that it has been thoroughly baptized in blood of friends and foes! But, my friends, the religion of Jesus is stained only with the blood of its friends. Its weapons are not carnal; it claims no affinity with the sword, the rifle, or the spear. No, it teaches men to love their enemies, not to burn them; to save and not to kill.—But we proceed, leaving "Plain Dealing" to his own reflexion, to consider the subject of the "immortality of the Soul," as Plato and his Disciples term a something alleged to be in man, which they cannot define!

Words are signs of ideas, both common and revealed. Revelation in its restricted meaning, signifies the things revealed or made known by the Spirit of God. Hence the ideas contained in the Scriptures are spiritual ideas or things; and these are expressed in Spiritual words and phrases, or signs adequate to their conveyance. Thus Paul says, 'Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which comes from God, that we might know the things which are gifted to us by God. Which things also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Spirit, explaining spiritual things (or ideas) in Spiritual words."—Now here are two classes of words;—first, "*words taught by human wisdom*," and secondly, "*words taught by the Spirit;*" the former may be termed, the language of Ashdod; and the latter, the language of Canaan. It is a rule, which you will find sustained throughout Scripture, that Spiritual ideas are never couched in the language of the Philosophy, contemporaneous with the writers of the Word, nor are human traditions clothed with Spiritual words. Hence, if a phrase current among the Philosophers of old and the people, be not in the Bible, the *idea* of that phrase is not there either. Now, the phrases 'Immortal Soul' and 'Immortality of the Soul,' 'belong to the first class, namely, of words taught by human wisdom;' for neither of them are to be found in the Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. The phrases were first used by the Leaders of the Multitudes; who in Scripture are termed 'animal or natural men.' My opponent tells us, that the 'Immortality of the Soul' was believed in the time of Jesus, by Pagans and Jews. We grant it, and what then? Why, that natural or animal men understood certain of the 'mysterious wisdom of God' before Jesus revealed it! But to say this would be to contradict the Scripture; for Paul says, that the wisdom of God on these topics had been 'hitherto concealed,' and that 'life and immortality were brought to light by Jesus Christ *in the Gospel*.' The doctrine of Immortality is a 'Spiritual thing' and, therefore, from its very nature, was incomprehensible to the world of animal men, until spiritually revealed. 'Now,' says Paul, "an animal man receives not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him." This is true; for when the Apostle announced the Immortality of Man by a resurrection from the dead at Athens, the Epicurean and Stoic Leaders of the ignorant multitude, mocked him for a babbler! And even now the Scriptural teaching on this topic is as incredible and absurb in the estimation of my opponent and the mass of it was to them.

I have said that the phrase 'Immortal Soul' or 'Immortality of the Soul' is not in the Bible; therefore, I conclude, that the idea or thing is not taught there. But among 'the words taught by the Spirit,' there are immortal, immortality, Spirit, Soul, and so forth; hence the ideas or things signified are there too. But Soul is one idea, an 'Immortal Soul' quite another, and Immortality is one thing, and 'Immortality of the Soul' another. Soul, Immortal, Immortality are indeed found in the Bible, but 'Immortal Soul,' and 'immortality of the Soul' are not, but chiefly in the speculations of Plato, and in the systems of scholastic divinity.

It is important, when persons listen to the conversation and discourse of others, that they should, if they would comprehend one another, understand the language or terms used by the speaker. 'Define your terms,' then, is good advice, introductory to the investigation of any controverted subject. We will take the hint, and endeavour to ascertain the signification of certain words, with which we have to do. And here I would just observe, that I believe in the soul, spirit, and the doctrine of Immortality as taught in the Bible; though I do not at all believe in the traditions of the Apostacy, concerning them. The former, I receive with all my heart; the latter, I reject as Pagan, Papistical, and absurd.

First, then, as to the word *soul*. In ascertaining the meaning of the word, we must consult the Hebrew; for the Bible word, which is translated *soul* existed in common use among the Jews hundreds of years before the English language was spoken. That is, when David wrote in the Hebrew language, that God would not leave Messiah's soul in the grave, there was no such word as our word soul. It will not do, therefore, to consult English Dictionaries for its definition; they merely give the *opinions*, of Englishmen and Americans; that is, they define the word soul according to the theories of these people. The proper way to arrive at the truth is, to see how the Hebrew word is used in the Bible. And here, I would observe, that in interpreting the Scriptures, we must define the words of Scripture *by the doctrine, and by the sense put upon them by the Context.* It will not do for us to say that the word soul, for instance, means 'a separate and independent immortal spirit,' and then put that construction upon it wherever we may find it in the Word. For instance, it says, and 'every living soul in the Sea died;' it would be absurd to say, 'and every separate and independent immortal spirit' died!' 'Why will you die, O house of Israel!' according to our friend's, version, or rather perversion of that passage, and definition of Soul would mean, 'why will you bring the pains of death upon your separate and independent Immortal Spirit!' 'In the day, that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die,' according to him would be 'in the day that thou eatest thereof, thy separate and independent Immortal Spirit shall die! And so on!

Hence we conclude, that the word, or in fact words in general are never used absolutely or unqualifiedly, but always contextually; that is, that the words Soul, Spirit, Immortal, &c, have as many significations as they have different Contexts.—We shall now proceed to ascertain the meaning of the word used by the Hebrews, and rendered by the English Translators of the Scripture, *Soul.*

The Hebrew word is *Nphsh*, or Naphash. It is a substantive noun, or the name of something which has a being. Its gender is common to male and female, but more usually feminine. It is also a verbal substantive, that is, it is a noun derived from the verb *Nophash*,* which signifies 'to breathe strongly, to

*If these words be read with the Masoretic points, the verb may be

pant;' it also signifies 'to take breath' as after fatigue. The noun Naphash, has a great variety of meanings, all of which depend upon the connexion in which they are used. Gesenius, whose Lexicon is before me, has arranged them under *five* classes, with *phrases*, selected from the Bible, illustrative of each definition. Under the first head, its contextual significations are 'breath, breath of life; also odour, perfume, which any thing *breathes* or EXHALES;' and would you believe it, my friends, but this word, which has been so arbitrarily defined to be 'an Independent and Immortal Spirit,' is here reduced to a connexion with the humble term 'smelling bottles!'—Isaiah 3. 20.

Under the second head, we read as follows:—"The vital Spirit," in Greek '*psuchee*,' in Latin, 'anima, through which the body lives, i. e. the principle of life manifested in the breath, (compare *ruach*, Lat. anima collated with Gr. *anemos*) and whose seat was supposed to be in the blood. Lev. 17. 11. Deut. 12. 23. Gen. 9. 4. 5. Hence life, vital principle, *animal* spirit, Gen. 35: 18. "*as her spirit was departing*, that is, as she gave up the ghost" or her life." 1. Kings 17: 21. *let now the Spirit of this child return* to him again," that is, let his life return. "Exod 21: 23, *life for life*. This life, Spirit, anima itself is said to live Gen: 12: 13. Ps. 119: 175." And, my friends, mark too, that this same naphash, or Soul, is also said "TO DIE, Judg. 16: 39." Also "*to be killed*, Numb. 31: 19. —to be asked for 1 Kings 3: 11.—*to be poured out*, as if along with the blood, Lam. 2: 12; Is. 53: 12. It is very frequent in phrases which have respect to the losing or preserving of life. Farther also in many expressions which have respect to the sustenance of life by food and drink, and the contrary, where the English Version often renders Naphash by *Soul* but improperly. Thus the *Spirit*, *anima*, is said to be *satiated* with food and drink, Prov. 27: 7. Is. 55: 2; so *to fill* i. e. to satisfy one's Spirit, Prov. 6: 30. and *hence Naphash is itself put for aliment*, Is. 58: 10, if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted Soul," or if thou give out thy *food* or *aliment* to the hungry that he may be filled. "So the opposite: *my spirit hungers*, Prov. 10: 3. 27. 7, *thirsts*, Prov. 25: 26, *fasts*, Ps. 69: 11, *abstains* from certain kinds of food Lev. 30: 3, *is polluted* by them, Ez. 4: 14. Also the *spirit* is *empty*, i. e. hungry Is. 29: 7; *to open wide the life*, *spirit*, i. e. tropically for the jaws, throat, Is. 5: 14. Hab. 2: 5."—And, says Gesenius, 'of the Spirit as separated from the body, Job. 14: 22.'—But on turning to this reference we find that he is not sustained in this definition. It reads 'His flesh upon him shall have pain, and

---

nounced, as if written *Nophash;* the *o* as *o* in *not*, and the *a* as *a* in *ram*; and the noun, Nephesh. The orthoepy, however, of the Hebrew being lost the pronunciation is arbitrary if the points be rejected, and does not at all affect the signification of the terms.

his soul within him shall mourn.' Job was talking about the calamities to which a man is subjected in this life, the effect of which is to fill him with painful and sorrowful emotions.—"Thou washest away, O God, the things which grow out of the dust of the earth," which things are the hope of man who tills it; 'thou destroyest' says he 'the hope of man' by floods, and so forth. Now what is the effect of these misfortunes upon cultivators? The answer is in the mind of every planter, that he is 'altogether pained;' his hopes of abundant crops being dashed, he is pained and troubled in body, soul and spirit, the whole man.

Under the *third* head, Naphash is rendered "the rational soul, mind, animus, as the seat of the affections, feelings, emotions of various kinds;" in other words, it signifies the *Brain*, which is demonstratively the seat of the feelings, affections, and emotions. "To it are attributed *love* (Amativeness) *joy* (the pleasing emotions which flow from the gratifications of Acquisitiveness, Love of Approbation, Hope &c.) *fear* (Cautiousness) *piety* toward God (Veneration) *confidence* (Hope) *desire* (Acquisitiveness) longing or appetite, e. g. for food (Alimentiveness) *revenge and slaughter, hatred, and contempt, vengeance and sorrow, and as the seat of warlike valour* (Destructiveness, Combativeness and Self-Esteem). It is spoken of the feelings in general, "*ye know the feelings of a stranger, or how* a stranger or foreigner feels"—a knowledge, which has been but little displayed towards me in this debate—1 Sam. 1: 15, I have poured out my Soul before Jehovah, i. e. have laid open to him my inmost feelings.

Words also which themselves express feelings of the mind or soul, are often used in connexion with Naphash in this sense; thus the soul is said to weep; to be poured out in tears; to cry for vengeance; and also to invoke blessings. More rarely things are attributed to the soul, which belong rather to the mode of feeling and acting, as pride, patience, and impatience, to the will or purpose; to the understanding or faculty of thinking.

Under the *fourth* head, concretely it signifies 'animal in which is the *Naphash* anima, or life. Josh. 10: 28, every animate or living creature. v. 30, 32, 35, 37. After *animal or life*, i. e. endued with life, *living animal*, or as more commonly in English, *living soul, living being*, Gen. 2: 7, and very often collectively for *living things*, living creatures, Gen. 1: 21, 24; 9: 10, 12, 15; Lev. 11: 10. In Gen. 2: 19, and whatsoever Adam called them, the living creatures (or souls) that was their name. Deut. 24: 7, to steal a soul, i. e. to steal a man. Lev. 4: 2, 'if a soul (that is, if any one) shall sin.' In a census of the people, seventy souls, i. e. persons. Gen. 12: 5, 'the slaves (the souls) they had acquired in Haran.' Naphash, or soul, in certain contexts signifies ONE DEAD, A DEAD BODY, A CORPSE.—Numb. 6: 6, let him not come near to a (naphash) *dead body*.'

Under the *fifth* head, with a suffix, or particle attached, it is very frequently used for *I myself*. The German *selb*, *selber*, Swedish, *sjel*, English, *self*, are all from the same root with the German *Seele*, in English *Soul*,."—Robinson's Gesenius under the word *Naphash*.

From all this, it is obvious, that no arbitrary, absolute, or unqualified definition, nor any consistent doctrine, can possibly be constructed upon the word used for soul in the Hebrew Bible. If one say, that the Naphash, in English *Soul*, is an immortal spirit, another would turn to Numb. 6: 6, and show that the word meant 'a dead body;' or if a third should affirm that soul, was 'a dead body,' a fourth might turn to Joshua 10: 28, and show, that it signified 'a living creature;' and so throughout, to the utter confusion of every hypothesis framed upon any one definition of the word. Hence if called upon to define the word *soul*, insulated, as it were, from every collateral phrase or word, it would be utterly impossible to do it; for the meaning of the word depends upon the context to which it stands related.—*End of the Speech.*

But suppose I had said, without qualification, that *nphsh* signified 'smelling bottle," what will Messrs. Campbell and Watt do, with Isaiah, 58: 10, where Gesenius says, that *Naphash* is itself put for *aliment*" or food? Are these my friends, so ignorant of language as not to know that *metonymically* naphash *life* is put for *aliment* or that which sustains it? Mr. Watt rung the changes a good deal, for he could do little else, upon the phrase, "why art thou cast down, O my smelling bottle!" Now, if he had had sagacity enough, he would have discovered, that he was displaying his own ignorance and not Dr. Thomas'. Surely there is as much propriety in that as "why art thou cast down O my aliment!" But, I will not descend further to deprive him of what little consolation he may draw from his 'spirited and powerful elaboration' of a smelling bottle.

After Mr. Watt comes my old friend Henley! Rapped on the knuckles first by one and then by another; now pouncing upon Scylla, and then upon Charybdis, it is as much as he can do to keep his barque from sinking. We believe he means well, though he has not the happiest way in the world of showing it. He has written a letter to Mr. Campbell, which bears upon its front the mark of haste and misconception. My friend says "*we* have passed no resolution." I do not know whom he means by '*we;*' but if the reader turn to p. 237 of this volume, he will find that I have no where said thata resolution had been passed. What I have written there, I declare to have come under my own observation; and I can give authority for it too. He goes on to say "We had no fears among ourselves that the *opinion* of any man on earth would be an article of faith among us;" why then all this agitation about the opinion of Dr. Tho-

as!—He thinks I have treated a communication he refers to with "*silent contempt.*"—This shows the *animus* of my old friend. Why should he surmise, that I entertain a feeling of contempt towards him or his? I protest, that none are contemptible in my eyes except the worthless. I respect him highly as a man; though somewhat unstable withal. I am so much occupied in brightening up my defensive and offensive armour, that I often put a letter aside intending to notice it at 'a more convenient season,' when it entirely escapes my recollection until too old to be of interest. If in so doing I have offended my old friend, I ask him a thousand pardons.

He still harps upon "infants, idiots, and heathens," which at most I have but incidentally noticed. I refer him to the article "Things contended for" paragraphs, 17, 18, for a hint upon this matter. Does my friend understand the scriptures as making no difference between those who live under "times of ignorance" and times of knowledge; if he does not, I would advise him to search deeper before he judge.

It seems, that he was well nigh denouncing me at the instigation of some he terms brethren, as well as Mr. Campbell. I doubt not but I shall be proscribed by all Churches, which regard a hint from Bethany as tantamount to a command: but let "Elders of Churches" remember, that if they judge unrighteously they may wrap it up here with Mr. Campbell, but they will have to render a strict account to their Lord and ours.

The next document is signed by ten well-meaning, but mistaken, men. One name, I regret, to see; because, I am persuaded he acts under the influence of others. But these things will be. They profess to act for the Church, which I believe, amounts to about 70 or 80 members. It is dated from Philadelphia, in which City I resided about 11 months. While I was there, two parties existed in the Church. Overtures were made by one to sustain me, if I would remain and endeavour to establish a Church upon more scriptural principles. But I refused, and prefered rather to leave than to be the leader of a party. The decision of this Church is an *ex-parte* judgement. For the last *three volumes* I have had but two Subscribers belonging to that Church. One a Sister, and the other is dead. Let the reader judge then, how competent these good people are to judge between me and Mr. Campbell!. They decide my case upon the testimony (such it is!) of the Mill. Harb! Here is a Church cuts me off from its fellowship, because of what is termed my dogmatism; for, says the Extra on Dr. Thomas, "He went to Philadelphia. I saw him there in December, 1833. The brethren in that City in general gave him a good character—said that he improved in the knowledge of the Scriptures; but was too self-opinionated and dogmatical;"—all this of course in their opinion! The Philadelphia Excommunication is full of such terms as they have learned

from Mr. Campbell; such as, 'an incorrigible factionist,' 'abominable and subversive speculations,' 'a dogmatic and vindictive spirit,' and so forth!

But these good people are some of the most inconsistent I ever knew. A brother visited them from these parts, and spoke much to the edification of them all. He tells me, that he taught the very same doctrine I am accustomed to do, and that it was received very well by all but one; who got up and opposed him. While this member was speaking, another closed up to brother ———, and advised him to take no notice of what that man was saying, for he was cracked! Or words to that effect. And now we have, within about four months after, ten men signing on the side of the cracked man, in condemnation of the very doctrine they approved when spoken by the mouth of another person! Surely, themselves being judges, the cracked man was the only wise man among them!

These ten have as fair names, and they sound as well, and with the public, carry as much weight as any other ten, that could be put in type; and of whom the world knows as little. With eight out of the list, we are more or less acquainted. Owen Flanagan, whose strength is but weakness, knows more about the Scriptures than the rest put together. I believe he was once employed as a reader of the Bible among the peasantry of Ireland. He used to meet with a few plain, but worthy people, before the Church at Bank Street, had a being; I think for two years. I have heard these good folks regret, that they ever joined Mr. Ballantyne's Church; which was constituted upon any but Apostolic principles. They informed me, when I went among them, that his company was made up of Messrs Heaslit, Hall, Harpham, and, I think, Brindley; with a few females of their families. Ballantyne was appointed *Elder*, Heaslit and Harpham *Deacons*, and Hall and the females the congregation. The Elder would leave his flock to minister for the Baptists, while the Church at home had to occupy their time as they best could, which, I was told, they did by singing, praying, and reading from a volume of printed Sermons, &c!— As to Mr. Harpham, who, I believe, I once met in Cincinnati, and who, no doubt, is a very correct man, *he was added to their Church by a letter from 'a sister Church'* (Dagg's in Philadelphia, of the Baptist sect) *three months after he was made a deacon!* These are some of the things of which I was informed soon after I went to Philadelphia—things, which speak volumes for the intelligence of Messrs Heaslitt, Hall, and Harpham, three of the signers of the document before me, in the doctrine of Christ! Owen Flanagan's party was engrafted upon this stock, much to their regret, as they have expressed to me. John Winfield, if he be the Senior, is a weak, inoffensive, and unintellectual man; if the junior, I think, if my recollection serves me, he was the subject of a reprimand from

the Church. I know but little of J. L. Rhees; what little I do know is no discredit to him. I believe he is an intelligent and moral man. His opinion of Isaac Cole, a cosigner with him, as expressed to a brother in this County, I am convinced is very correct. Isaac Cole is Son-in-law to the late Mr. Ballantyne; and, when I left Philadelphia, a deacon of a Baptist Church in New Jersey, and at the same time a worshipper at Bank Street. He is devoted to making money, after which he drives with his whole soul. He is a blustering, jovial, good-natured sort of a man; but as his brother Rhees says, he knows little or nothing about the Christian Religion, or words to that effect. Of Rowzee and Davis, I know nothing. Benjamin Andrews is the tenth; of him, I say, though he slay me, I will kiss the hand of my destroyer.. I love him for his kindness to me while in Philadelphia; and take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for his goodness. James Hall yet remains to be noticed. His integrity may be deduced from the following incident. When about to commence the Advocate he *promised* to take two copies. The first number was dated from Richmond, as I intended to remove thither. Finding upon the presentation of No. 1., that I was about to leave Philadelphia, the following conversation ensued—*Hall*—'Bro. Thomas, I find you are going to R.? You will get no more subscribers about here.' I replied, very possibly. *Hall.*—'You will loose those you have in this City.' I cannot help it, I rejoined, my engagements are made. *Hall.*—If you go it will not suit me to subscribe.' Very well, said I, do as you please; I want none but willing patrons. To Richmond I go!—This incident proves two things, first, that after 11 months acquaintance with my opinionatedness' he wished me to stay in Philadelphia; and secondly, that he makes promises without fulfilling them, and therefore, his signature goes for nothing in a question of truth or error. Such then, are these my judges, who publicly disclaim all connexion with me and those who hold fellowship with me in my pernicious views!" I should not have searched them thus, had they not stirred me up in self-defence. I feel more honored by their rejection of me, than I should by their communion. They are intellectually and therefore morally incompetent to sit as judges upon what I believe and teach. When they know all that God has revealed in the Bible, it will then be time enough for them, when appealed to by both parties, to ascend the throne of Christ, and render to me and Mr. Campbell 'according to our work's.

Then comes Albert R. Flippo, to vindicate himself from having any part or lot with me in my 'thirty-four speculations!'—He expresses great regret at my course of which, however, he is but partially informed. He designates Mr. Campbell's defence of New Platonism, as the championship of a "noble cause" against the bold assumptions of Materialism and

Annihiliation!" That is, in plain english, that it is a noble cause to undertake to show that a man can attain to "life and incorruptibility" without obeying the gospel! He has 'charity enough' not to denounce me as "a deluded Mormonite." He thinks, too, that "the Advocate has nearly exhausted himself on his favorite topics." But in this his opinion he will perhaps find himself mistaken. Bro Flippo should recollect that all heads are not equal; and that if his has been long since emptied, mine is yet full.

The result of this apology is that Mr. Campbell flatters him with the peculiar phrase of "*our* brother Flippo." It is "Mr. Flippo" if he be suspected of rejecting the nostrum of Plato, about "disembodied spirits;" it is simple "brother" if a Christian man be thought to waver; but it is "*our* brother Walthall," or "*our* brother Flippo," if it be thought worth while to disengage a brother from me, or if it be judged proper to reward another for a public condemnation of "the incorrigible factionist Dr. Thomas," for whom there is no grace!!!

In conclusion, Mr. Campbell proclaims, that "he will forestall his correspondents on this subject, by informing them, that, except from the Church of Richmond, of which Dr. Thomas is yet a member, we do not intend to publish any further communication concerning his case."—But, not so fast Mr. Campbell.

I am not a member of the Church in Richmond; nor have I been for the last sixteen months. I belong to the Church of Christ, and to that portion of it which meets at Paineville, Amelia, Va. This Church, as my readers know, has taken up my case, and has addressed the Brethren at large upon the subject. I demand, and the Paineville Church demands, and the brethren in these parts, and especially those in the neighborhood of the Debating ground, they all demand, that, that document be published in the Harbinger as soon as it is received. We are advised that, down to the present moment. Feb. 21, 1838, there has been no meeting in Richmond concerning me. My eye is upon their proceedings. I shall take care to be informed of whatever may occur there upon the subject. I shall ascertain the movers and the signers, and from that be quite prepared for any thing that may issue thence.

Calm and unruffled in the midst of all, because conscious of rectitude, and of being sustained by the testimony of God, I look down with commiseration, upon the impotency of my assailants! May the Lord have pity upon them all, and forgive the unrighteousness of their doings; for I believe assuredly, that they know not what they do!

EDITOR.

Liberty, Amelia, Va. Feb. 21th, 1838.

My Infidelity.

At the Debate, my clerical opponent said, that he came there to show, the tendency of Dr. Thomas' sentiments to infidelity and atheism. When his effort had expired, a gentleman, formerly a Baptist Preacher, and lately excommunicated with others, because he fellowships me, observed, that he was astonished any one should charge me with infidelity, or my principles with a tendency to it, inasmuch as I had convinced more persons of the truth of the Christian Religion in that county (Lunenburg) than any other man.—'Yes, Sir,' rejoined Mr. —— ——, one of the Moderators, 'if I had never heard Dr. Thomas, I should have been an avowed infidel long ago.'

This anecdote was reported to me by the brother alluded to about three days since. According to our Lord's rule '*by their fruits you shall know them*,' this incident speaks more in favor of my principles than a thousand pages written in my own defence. Certain interested men would rejoice to succeed in metamorphosing me into a disciple of Paine, Volney, or Voltaire, were it for nothing else than to prove the sublimity of their own predictions; but while I can adduce such *fruit* as the above, honest men will *know* that my doctrine is of Christ and his Apostles, to the utter confusion and disgrace of all liars.

Editor.

LETTER FROM KING & QUEEN.

January, 11*th*, 1838.

Brother Thomas:—Dear Sir; the present period, among the Disciples in Eastern Virginia, is marked by much distraction, not unfrequently attended with very unchristian feeling. Opposing *parties*, in any of the numerous states of civilized, social combinations, may be justly considered one of the most serious of evils. Such a state of things may be always expected to destroy the best consequences of union, unity, harmony, power, wisdom, virtue or *religion*, as the case may be. Hence, in the wisdom of the Saviour, *his followers were urged to the most rigid adherence to unity and harmony among themselves*. Many of us have considered the unity and harmony of the Disciples of the reformation, to be of the *same character*, and hoped that they would be productive of such effects as were exhibited by primitive christianity; that the word of the Lord would run, and be glorified in, and by us. Much has been accordingly accomplished; but we seem at length to have fallen into a sort of a "*fiery trial*," which for a time at least, must cast a deep shade over our (formerly) bright prospect. Parties have arisen more or less distinctly, among us, and the worst effects of division and strife are to be apprehended. The world of mankind, must unavoidably suffer by any extensive christian aberration.

We, who now take the liberty of addressing you, are fully persuaded, that our more talented members have contributed largely in bringing about this state of things. That the brethren who have been thus influential, have acted under the most conscientious reasons, we have no doubt. As to ourselves, we

wish no disguise as to our course, and are determined, *if it be possible to avoid it*, not to become mere partizans, contrary to the known laws of Jesus our King. We do believe brother Campbell's and *your course*, constitute the foundation and cause of our present confusion. There is something, perhaps many things, wrong among us. Whether you two are to be blamed alone, for going before, or the body of the Disciples too, for falling into the way of difficulty, may not be easily settled. As far as we can judge, all are honest, and truly sincere, but certainly, all are not right. We are all liable to err, but should still seek after truth. Some of the congregations and many individuals, have thought it proper to express their dissent from an important "*opinion*" of brother Campbell, touching the question of what constitutes *a christian*. In do'ng so, we did what we considered to be our duty towards him and ourselves, *and will here stop*, whether his explanation be satisfactory or not, rather than create strife.

Upon the *same great question, in another form*, we now address you. Your attention has been *repeatedly* called to this subject, in *different ways, long ago*. You need hardly be reminded of a proposed discussion, tendered by one of us, immediately after your introduction of the subject of *re-immersion;* nor of a QUERY put by some three or four of us in this neighborhood, sometime about *last May*, through brother P. B. P. One of us, during last fall, addressed you again in reference to this query. *You declined publishing, or answering these papers.* We have determined therefore, jointly, to call up these matters *once more.* We do not mean to meddle with *your opinions upon any subject whatever;* but upon your *language* and *course*, do earnestly ask a declaration of your *faith* upon *a single, specific point of teaching and practice.* The Disciples in this quarter, are divided *by your course*, upon this question. "Are the Disciples among us, who have come out of the Baptist Churches, recognized by Dr. Thomas as Christians." Many among us contend that you do recognize such *as christians, both in word and deed;* while many others are fully persuaded that both *your language and practice* justify an opposite conclusion; and not only so, but that *you do teach* that the Baptist denomination is not christian, and ought, as you say on page 192 of the current A. Advocate, (taking the Richmond church *as one instance of many*) to "select some good readers from your ranks; let them read to you without note or comment, the instructions of the Prophets and Apostles as contained in the scriptures; accompanying this public reading with a private and diligent study of the word; after *six months* [but the Word saith *to-day*] if you believe the teaching you have heard read, then let every such man and woman obey the voice of the Holy Spirit by Peter;—amend your lives

and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remssion of your sins," &c.

Now Dear Sir, with this state of things before you, we, ask not *your opinion as in exceptions among that people*, but, we wish you in *manly* and *christian candour*, to declare *explicitly*, whether you BELIEVE, from all the *testimony* and *evidence* presented in word and deed by the mass of us who have come out from the Baptist ranks, that we are *christians* or not, *without re-immersion?* You have studied the subject well, and known many of us for several years. We desire a *short*, and *unequivocal* answer. If the question should not appear to your clearer mind, to cover the ground fairly, we trust that you will take and answer it in a more enlarged sense. It is high time for us to come to a satisfactory adjustment of this distracting subject. We urge the insertion of this address in the next No. of the Advocate. Should you determine not to let it appear please return it to one of us without delay.

Your's in prusuit of truth, and christian unity,

THOMAS M. HENLEY,
JOHN DU VAL.

To all "in the pursuit of Truth and Christian Unity"

Greeting.

In the spring of 1837, I received a query *through* my worthy and much esteemed friend and brother, Philip Baylor Pendleton of Smyrna, King & Queen, Virginia. It ran thus—"On page 201 of the January Advocate, you speak again of the questionable state of hundreds or perhaps thousands of those who have left the Baptist Denomination, and seem to predicate your opinion upon the ground that they were born in Anti-christ. Now we are somewhat perplexed hereabouts by your language, and must request you to state, whether you mean by the hundreds and thousands exceptions among the genuine Christians, who have left Anti-christ? And if so, further inform us how the genuine Christians can be so, while they were born under the like circumstances with the spurious? In other words, do you consider them to have been born of water and *Spirit*, who have come out of the Baptist Denomination? You see I have broken open this letter to put in this Query."

Various circumstances, which I do not now remember, prevented the query from receiving that prompt attention which it seems, the querists desired. Accordingly, brother P. B. Pendleton repeated it in a letter dated July 4th, 1837. In that document, is the following remark;—"some think you will not answer the query at all, others think you will answer it evasively; at all events let us have an answer, for I think much depends upon it."

This comment impressed my mind with the idea, that there was something working below the surface, which did not appear on the face of the query. I determined, therefore, before I took any notice of it, to carry it up with me to the Debate, where I expected to meet many brethren from divers parts, and to submit it to them for their consideration. The result of this occasioned our notice in the August Number under the Caption, "To Correspondents and Readers"—p. 144.—This elicited a note from brother Du-Val of King & Queen, dated Sept. 15th, 1837.

KING & QUEEN, *Sept. 15th*, 1837.

Brother Thomas:—In your August No. of the Advocate under the head of replies to "correspondents," you notice a query put, as you say, "*through* Brother P. B. P." and state your suspicion that it is "a gin to entrap" you in your words, suggested by some other person; bro. P. B. P. being ignorant of its design. Now as to this matter, you are partially right. If I am right in applying the initials, you are not altogether wrong in your conjectures. The *query* resulted from a discussion between four of the disciples in this neighborhood, an honest discussion of some point taught or asserted by you in some back No. of the Advocate. Some of us thought that you taught one thing, while bro. Pendleton (P. B. P.,) thought differently. He had a letter in his pocket, ready to be mailed to you, by which, we all concluded to enquire of you as to the import of your language. We wish you to settle the matter yourself; seeing that we could not. As your words were of doubtful import, as proved by our controversy, we thought an explicit answer from you, should settle the question. But who dictated the query? which you think a "gin." If my memory serves me, I dictated it, and brother P. transcribed it over his name into his letter. He was equally interested with the rest of us, in the subject; we all sought the simple truth. Those of us, who objected to what we considered you to teach, wished you to speak in language which could not be mistaken, while bro. Pendleton, who warmly sided with you, or defended his understanding of your words, had no hesitation, in making further inquiry. It is strange indeed, that you should think that any thing *underhanded* was meant, while you had the ostensible enquirer before you without disguise. With brother P's permission, I would cheerfully have appended my name, had it not been for the fact, that you and I, are not on what are called commonly "good terms." We have desired no secresy in this matter, nor have we employed disguise of an improper character. I humbly conceivethat it was far more proper for bro. P, to put the query, under existing circumstances, than it would have been for me to have done it. Either broth-

ren Roy or Walker could have given their name with propriety.

Your insinuations having been quite pointed, both as to bro. P. as well as to some other, I hope that you will give this note of explanation, a place in the next Advocate.

Your's truly,

J. DU VAL.

To the spirit and style of this letter, I have no objection, and am well satisfied with the explanation in relation to the query. I except, however, to this sentence of it—"You and I are not on what are cal'ed commonly, "good terms."—I do not recollect ever having exchanged an uncivil word with Brother Du Val. Save the letter quoted, I believe, I have received no communication from him since we met at the Acquinton, I think, in 1836. On that occasion I took brother Du Val to be quite on good terms with me. When last in the lower country, in the autumn, I made inquiry upon the subject, and all I could ascertain was that I had slighted some letter or other he had written. This brought to my recollection; that I had received an epistle in 1835 or 6, on the subject of re-immersion. I met Bro. Tompkins of King and Queen, now of Mississippi, at Lynchburg, on my return from Henry. He informed me, that there was a letter, from Dr. Du Val waiting for me in Richmond. When I arrived in that City, I found it there. It was quite lengthy. I read it of course, but being disposed to let the subject of Re-Immersion rest a while, in conformity with the wishes of those, who deprecated the agitation of the subject, I put it aside for "a rainy day," or until "a more convenient season."—In conclusion, I would observe, that, if failing to notice all the letters sent me by my friends, is to place me on bad terms with them, I fear my enemies will be far more numerous than I have yet surmised. Once for all, let no one inscribe my name in his Black Book, because I fail in formally responding to his communications;—I thank my correspondents for their favors, and have, in many instances, been edified, encouraged, instructed, amused, and corrected; all of which comes home with double force, if their letters be post paid.

I do not recollect the contents of said letter at this time, but, I suppose, this sentence, in the letter signed "Thomas M. Henley," and "John Du-Val," has reference to something it contained;—"you need hardly be reminded of a proposed discussion, tendered by one of us, immediately after your introduction of the subject of re-immersion."—Now, let me observe here that I did not introduce the subject of re-immersion. It naturally flowed from the doctrine of "Baptism for the Remission of sins, "as first taught in this Country by brother Walter Scott, or Mr. Campbell; and, appeared for the first time, I believe, in the Millennial Harbinger. The Editor succeeded in putting it

to silence, but not in convincing all the readers of his writings and the Scriptures. I resumed its discussion, and was satisfied to contend with one opponent at a time, and he the greatest. This is my reply to that part of said letter.

My respected friends, add, alluding to this epistle and the query, and the Doctor's note, "you declined publishing or answering these papers." This is not correct. In my notice to "Correspondents" I said, "nevertheless the query shall be fairly met *in due time* come what will." The time being due, they are now (save the letter of 1835 or 6, which is I know not where) before the reader. It is strange, passing strange, that the agitation of this subject should be so much deprecated as being of a schismatical tendency, and yet I should be so 'repeatedly called upon' to take it up! But I can see!

I come now more particularly to the letter with the double signature. It is in the hand writing of brother Du Val. To him, therefore, I attribute the style and spirit of it. I have no fault to find with either; and, but for brother Henley's late epistle to Mr. Campbell, I would very readily concede to him a share in the excellencies it displays. But when I compare that document with the manuscript before me, I discern so marked a difference, that the vinegar of the one curdles his part of the milk of the other to some extent. There, he writes in a spirit, which dictates the title "Dr. Thomas," while here it is "Brother Thomas, Dear Sir;" there, I am accused, while here, I am reasoned with; there, he is a judge upon false premises, while here he is "in the pursuit of truth," there, he threatens me and lets me into the true secret of the letter before me as far as he is concerned:—"I have been requested;" says he, "to unite with brethren to address him plainly, that they will not any longer countenance any man that writes as he does, before you disclaimed fellowship with him. *I put them off until he answered the queries, or could learn clearly his views.*"—The threat is this, if I answer this letter according to my conviction, *which I shall do,* he and some others will join with Mr. Campbell in unfellowshipping me, and very soon send me vastly more than twenty discontinuances! I am glad that I have delayed till this time the answer of the query. As I write not for money, but for what I believe to be the truth, let me say to all terrorists, that is, to all who would frighten me into their way of thinking and acting, that the loss of the fellowship of all Christendom, reformed or unreformed, or the loss of every subsriber I have, will not weigh one feather with me in avowing or pleading for what I believe the Scriptures teach. I concede to every man the right of maintaining what he pleases, provided he injures not his neighbor in liberty, reputation, property or life. If he teach error, *the truth is stronger than error,* and will ultimately overthrow it. The intelligence and faith of that Church is composed but of flimsy materials, which

are to be sapped, mined and overturned by the "speculations" of men! What I concede to others, I claim for myself; and as long as I have a pen to write, and a paper to transmit my convictions I shall publish them without regard to sinister appeals to my hopes or fears.—It is true I have rich opponents, but I have also rich friends, to whom the support of the Advocate would be a trifle. If therefore, I am to be put to silence, it must be by the power of truth, rationally and argumentatively sustained, and not by menaces or proscription.

Brother Henly put off his friends until, he could learn clearly my views. Now, my worthy friend, knows my views very well. While I lived in Richmond he called upon me, and we conversed upon the subject. At the end of our conference he expressed himself satisfied, and that he understood me. Until Mr. Campbell appealed to the sympathies of the Eastern Virginians, brother Henly proved by actions his friendly disposition towards me; since that time all the world knows the rest. I met him at Smyrna, in the autum of 1837, for the first time, after his "defence." I greeted him with the utmost cordiality of heart face and hand; though my salutation was met with the most frigid, and gloomy formmality. I wa amused, but not at all offended. In proof of this, I requested him to take part in the exercise of the morning; which he did. In his invocation he styled me "thy servant" that is, of God. When our meeting was dissolved, he invited me to go home with him; but, being previously engaged, I declined. At that visit, I saw nothing of brother Du Val; nor did brother Henly say one word to me about the topics in debate.

Bro. Henly thinks me inconsistent in calling him a brother, I think him much more so in calling me one after his "Beloved Brother Campbell" has told him, that I am no better than a deluded Mormonite, and that his brethren should not even fellowship those who fellowship me. Now if brother Henly fellowship me, he is manifestly excommunicated by the Church in Philadelphia, which has echoed the sentiments taught them, by Mr. Campbell! This appears to me to be the previous question—*will Thomas M. Henly and John Du Val, who are in fellowship with Alexander Campbell, fellowship John Thomas, whom he has pronounced to be subverted from the faith?* —If they will, then, Alexander and his Philadelphia brethren cut them off; for the latter "publicly disclaim all connexion with him, and those who hold fellowship with him in his pernicious views."—But if they will not—then it can be a matter of no importance to Messrs Henly and Du Val, whom Dr. Thomas does or does not fellowship! You see, reader, the dilemma; and you see also, how much more of *feeling* than of *principle* there is in this affair.

But as to this matter of *fellowship*. If one enquire of me,

'whom do you fellowship?'—I reply, that it is not a matter of choice, but of necessity with me, if I would stand myself in the fellowship of Jesus Christ. If I be myself in Christ, I am bound to fellowship all others in the same situation. If a man convince me that he is in Christ and of correct deportment, it is at my peril, to refuse to fellowship him as a brother. On the other hand, I cannot in my conscience fellowship a man, who is not in Christ. I fellowship no man, because he is *called* a reformer or a Christian. In passing through life we are obliged to take much upon trust, but when we come to particulars, if I give the right hand of brotherhood to another, it is because, I believe, that he has *obeyed the gospel of Jesus Christ.* In this, however, I may be deceived; my belief may be credulity: but until I discover my error, I must fellowship him.

I regard no immersed man as Christian, who has not believed and obeyed the Gospel preached by the Apostles. I have nothing to do with names, parties, or denominations in this matter of fellowship. I can fellowship some, who are yet Baptists, some Reformers and some Dunkards; not, however, because they are Baptists, Reformers, or Dunkards, but because they shall have understood, believed, and obeyed the Gospel of Jesus Christ. As things are, there is no denomination that can scripturally be termed the Body of Christ. For myself, I am a member of no 'Denomination,' nor do I ever intend to be. I would no more endorse for all men called Reformers not previously Baptists being "in Christ," than I would for all Baptists; the question with me would be, 'have you obeyed the gospel of Christ, and do you continue to walk worthy of that gospel, as taught in the New Testament? After this was satisfactorily proved, I would receive him into my house as a brother and 'bid him God speed.' Further than this, as an individual, I am not to go.

If asked my conviction in relation to the Baptist Denomination, *as a denomination*, I reply, that, from observation, and from the testimony of Baptists themselves, I am persuaded, that it is exceedingly corrupt. Whatever the Body of the Immersed was before 1685, I am convinced, that from that date until the era of the French Revolution in 1790, they constituted *a part* of the two symbolic witneses, whoses *dead* bodies lay three days and a half *unburied* in the street of the great City, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt. When "the breath of life from God entered into them," the Testimony of the Immersed against Anti-christ and in behalf of the Gospel of Christ revived in the old world. From thence it has been propagated through the new, though amplified in various ways. This testimony has been rejected by the Baptist Denomination, which, as a Denomination, has identified itself with the sects of the Anti-christian kingdom and thus become "part and parcel of the Symbolical Babylonish Empire."

It is impossible for me, were I appointed to the office, to *judge*

whether the mass of the people among reformers, who have come out from the Bapitst ranks are christian or not, without re-immersion. Correct moral conduct is no proof that the subject is a Christian; although correct moral conduct is essential to constitute a man a *good* Christian. There are good moral people, in the popular sense of the phrase, in all sects. I was a person of good moral conduct, but not a Christian, before I obeyed the gospel, my morality, however, would not have saved me *without obedience.* My faith upon the matter is, that I do not believe, that any one is a Christian who has not obeyed the gospel; and that fifty re immersions would not make him such, unless the fiftieth was predicated upon an antecedent intelligent belief of the gospel. Now, if any man would know whether he be in the faith, let him examine himself, and compare his case with that of the primitive Christians: if his and theirs are identical, then, he is safe; but if they be not, all I can say is, I would not die in his state for a thousand worlds.

Brother Henly in his letter to Mr. Campbell asks where I found any Apostle advocating re-immersion. To this I answer, that Paul prescribed a re-immersion to twelve men called "disciples" at Ephesus, and that the reason why he did so was because their first immersion was predicated upon a wrong faith. This is precisely the ground I take. When "the gospels" Epistles, and Acts were penned, the doctrine of the Spiritual Babylon had not been published, therefore, the disobedient of that time were not identified with it; but when the Apocalypse was written, after times were informed, that certain termed God's people would belong to that mystical Empire, and that in order to escape punishment, they must come out of Babylon. Now, the question is, WHAT DOES COMING OUT OF BABYLON CONSIST IN?—Yes, my readers, that is the question!

EDITOR.

Liberty, Amelia, Va. Feb. 26th, 1838.

THINGS CONTENDED FOR.

At this "Crisis" some may wish to know what are the things contended for by our Advocate. For the information of such inquirers we observe.

1. That he requires liberty of speech, and the free discussion of all subjects which to any one or more persons in society may appear to be revealed or treated of in the Scriptures; and at the same time, he deprecates the magisterial, or authoritative, interference of any man as a judge of controversies, or as a "Commander in Chief" on earth in the Army of the Faith. For, he contends, that, as the spiritual gifts of "*the word of wisdom*" and "*the word of knowledge*" are not now imparted, there lives not the man among men, who can of right say

concerning questions in debate, that this or that *is* "speculative or untaught." He may of right say, that a question is speculative, or that it is untaught in the Bible *in his judgment*, but to do otherwise, that is, to affirm positively, is to assume that he knows all that is revealed, that he is infallible in judging, or inspired. An Apostle or other Inspired Believer could infallibly pronounce certain questions to be untaught &c; but all that the uninspired of after times, especially of this day after so long a night of intellectual and moral darkness as that of ages past, can without presumption do, is to qualify their decision with *as it appears to them.* To do this would be to *receive one another without regard to doubtful disputation.* Hence the subjects of the "One Lord, the One Faith, and the one baptism," if they did not see eye to eye in all things, would at least "*agree to differ*," harmoniously.

2. He aims at the organization of communities, all of whose members should have *understood, believed* and *obeyed* THE GOSPEL.

3. He deprecates the *indiscriminate* amalgamation of all persons because they have been dipped and afterwards assented to a theory however true it may be. He contends, that it should be shown that the mind has been enlightened by "the word of the truth of the gospel" previous to immersion, before an immersed person is recognized as a brother in Christ.

4. He deprecates a resort to violent measures with respect to the immersed *already* in the Churches called "reformation Churches," who have seceded from the Baptist Sect; yet he would not, that the truth should be witheld from them by those of their associates who are convinced of the necessity of an intelligent obedience to the gospel for Remission and a title to Eternal Life. He is convinced, that this will be adequate to accomplish a genuine reformation *in all sincere enquirers after the truth* who have come out of that corrupt denomination; and of whom he doubts not, there are many among 'reformers.' But should this fail, then he would leave them in the hands of the Righteous Judge of all; who will determine impartially, and without respect of persons.

5. As to the members of the Baptist Sect still identified with it, he would as an individual express his decided negative to their admission into a Church of Christ unless they could show, that they had *understood and believed the gospel before they were dipped*, and *had subsequently demeaned themselves uprightly, having a good report with those without.* If they could not establish this satisfactorily, yet did, on their applying for admission, then understand and believe the gospel, and desired to be identified as citizens of heaven, having determined to walk worthy of the gospel, he would suggest the propriety of requiring them to be buried with Christ in baptism, though

they had been previously, yet indeed ignorantly, immersed.

6. He contends, that the indiscriminate admission of immersed persons has filled many of the Churches with ignorance, and corruption; and from experience, he knows, that such "re-"formers" have in certain places made 'this reformation' contemptible.

7. He pleads for an Eldership, whose plurality shall be proportioned to the bulk of the several Churches, and that, without respect to pecuniary considerations, the Presbyters be elected unanimously, or by an overwhelming majority, or by silent approbation or acquiescence in certain persons named, or by the nominated drawing lots; and he pleads for this as most scriptural in his judgment, and in order to guard the rights of the poor, and to secure an equal administration for all. And he contends further, that the nomination be made in rigid conformity with the description of what the man ought to be, who would exercise the office of a bishop; a description of character, which, he is persuaded, may be easily found *in a Church of Jesus Christ.* 1. Tim. iii. 2—7, Titus 1. 7—12.

8. He contends that the votes of majorities of the whole congregation are unscriptural, and calculated to oppress virtue and to establish vice. That the majorities of old, voted Christ out of doors, and anti-christ in. In Corinth, the votes were three to one against Christ, who was at last voted out, and compelled to fly into the wilderness. He contends, that the discipline of the Church is scripturally in the hands of the eldership, which by a decided, and not a bare majority, or casting vote, he thinks ought in the presence of the Congregation to determine, not according to rules or bye-laws of their own, but by the written laws of Christ and his Apostles, the affairs of the body.

9. He contends, that no citizen of the kingdom ought to be separated from a Church of Christ for *constructive* heresy. So long as a brother maintain his adhesion to the faith, and continue to walk worthy of his vocation, it is arbitrary, oppressive, and exceedingly despotic to pronounce him a "heathen man and a publican" in relation to Christians, because he holds sentiments which all the world, and even numbers of his brethren have not received, for there ever will be controversy concerning things revealed until the appearing of Jesus Christ.

10. He contends for the order of Christian worship as set forth in the first article of this number of the Advocate.

11. He contends for an inspired Psalmody to the entire rejection of the rhymes now in use, because, of the poverty and fictitiousness of much of their matter, together with the flatness and puerility of their style.

12. He protests against the use of big meeting machinery in the conversion of men. He contends, that we are bound to follow the practice of the Apostles and of their associates in

this matter as well as in the worship of God, for if proselytes are to be made, who shall be an ornament and grace before men, it is by the power of the truth, and not by human expedients, that they must be brought over.

13. He contends that no religionist, or sect of religionists whatever, ought to be recognised as in Christ, or as Christian in the scriptural sense of the word, unless they have believed and obeyed the gospel as plainly recorded in the New Testament.

14. He protest most conscienciously and unqualifiedly against every sect or denomination of Christendom, the exception, No. 13, alone excepted, as so many sections of the kingdom of Anti-christ, and therefore, that no ecclesiastical fellowship, or communion, ought to be held with them by a Christian in thought, word, or deed.

15. He contends for the testimony of the Word, to the effect, that the time is close upon us, when Christ Jesus our Lord and King will be revealed from heaven with the suddenness and unexpectedness of lightning 'and that when he comes he will raise the righteous dead, change the righteous living; and punish every soul of man in life, family or estate; without respect of persons, who either knows not God, or who has not obeyed *the Gospel* of salvation.

16. He contends, that the Scriptures teach, in effect, that men derive nothing from Adam but mortality in "body, soul, and spirit, the whole person." This is what he means, when he says, that man is absolutely and altogether mortal. He contends, that the grand difference between an 'animal man' and all other animals is, that God has constituted Man so, that he is *susceptible* of Immortality, that is, that he is *capable* of attaining to Eternal Life by an intelligent obedience to the commands and appointments of his Creator; which the interior animals are not.

17. He contends, that if after Adam's Expulsion from Eden God had not interfered any further in human affairs, the race of man would ultimately have become extinct, like the races of the Mammoth, Ichthyosaurian and other species. But that God did interfere, and that the result of that interference was, that *he offered eternal life* TO ALL WHO WOULD OBEY HIM under the several dispensations that have obtained, *and to none else.*

18. Consequently, that in this age, if any of Adam's race would become Immortal *he must obey* THE GOSPEL *and walk worthy of it afterwards.* Immortality is a thing to be sought for, and can be attained only by those who are able to seek; a seeking which must be in God's way, and not in man's. An intelligent man can discern all the consequences which flow from this position—consequences which it is not always well

to submit to the scornings of vulgar prejudice; upon the principle that we should not throw our pearls before swine.

19. That the unjustified are raised to life to be tried; sentenced, and executed, not by virtue of any inherent spark of immortality, but by the recreating or reorganizing power of God.

20. That when men die, they return to dust, and so long as they continue under the power of death, dust they remain; but that when the periods of the Resurrections come, they will rise from their ashes to life; which life will either be continued to them *endlessly*, or terminated again *violently*, according as they shall be righteous or wicked during their animal lives.

21. He contends that there is no Remission of Sins without Obedience in the strict import of that term. Nothing short of obedience to God's will whether under this or other Dispensations, will obtain for a man f rgiveness of sins or a title to Eternal Life. And this doctrine the Advocate considers enhances the value of the ANCIENT APOSTOLIC GOSPEL ten thousand fold.

22. He contends, that it is the Holy Spirit. who alone convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come; that he is the Comforter of all true believers; and that he both convinces and comforts in the absence of spiritual gifts, which were restricted to the Apostolic Age, by the Written Word alone; for, he contends, that if God were to speak with an audible voice from the heavens to convince men. or to comfort the faithful, he would add nothing to what is written in the Books of the Old and New Testaments.

These things he submits to the candid and impartial consideration of all noble minded people. He leaves such to determine whether infidelity or atheism lurk beneath them. He is convinced, that these things are true. He fears not, therefore, to contend for them earnestly though an ecclesiastical tempest may rage on every side. In thee, O God, do I put my trust!

EDITOR.

TESTIMONY

in re

MESSRS CAMPBELL, HUNNICUT, WATT AND THE "RELIGIOUS HERALD,"

versus

THE EDITOR OF THE ADVOCATE.

The completion of the present number of our paper has

been somewhat defered in order that we might give insertion to certain documents from Lunenburg in relation to many libellous *et cæteras*, which had by various persons, been imposed for truths concerning us upon the public. We have not room in this number for the article of the R. Herald; we shall publish it in our next. Upon receiving it, we despatched a messenger to the vicinity where the Debate occurred, some forty or fifty miles from hence, that he might lay its contents before those who heard the Discussion, and obtain from them their judgment in the case. He has just returned after an absence of about twelve days, being the bearer of writings, which testify most satisfactorily in our behalf. Thus far, 'all things have worked together for good.' Mr. Campbell's decision in favor of Mr. Watt, upon no other testimony than Mr. Watt's recommendation of himself; and the Religious Herald's Sub-editor's co-adjutorship with that person in deceiving the Baptist Public—have had the effect of rousing certain of the Citizens of Lunenburg, to right the injured, and cheer up the heart of the courageous in the faith. They have subscribed upwards of three hundred dollars for the immediate publication of the Debate, and have abundantly testified their sense of our labors upon that occasion. One goes on to say, that the Advocate will be supported, and that he, if necessary, will subscribe fifty dollars per annum to sustain it. But. this extraordinary aid, we trust will not be needed. With these few remarks, for we have room for no more at present, we introduce to the notice of our readers the following address from the Church of Christ assembling in the Forks of Meherrin, Lunenburg, Va; where our testimony against the Apostacy was held forth.

EDITOR.

Liberty, Amelia, Va. March, 10th, 1838.

—

We the Congregation of Christ, worshipping at the Fork Meeting House, in Lunenburg County; the place at which the debate between Mr. Jno. S. Watt and Dr. Jno. Thomas was held, which commenced on the 1st day of August, and continued during five days—to the brethren in Christ Jesus.—Whereas Bro. A. Campbell has called upon the Congregations generally, to act upon the decision of the Congregation of Paineville, to which Bro. Thomas belongs, which decision is published in the Advocate, and acquits Bro. Thomas of the charges brought against him by Bro. Campbell and others, or some of them at least; and in as much as many evil reports have been circulated concerning the debate, between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Watt, to the prejudice of Dr. Thomas, we in all due benevolence to Bro. Campbell and Bro. Thomas, submit the following report to the public; but before we proceed,

owing to the existing state of things, think it advisable to give a concise history of our Congregation. On the 26th day of November, 1834, we were constituted, taking the word of the Lord, as contained in the Old and New Testaments, for the rule of our Faith and Practice. Since our Constitution we have generally met on the first day of the week for worship; many have gone away from us, not on account so much of re-immersion as we believe, but because they were not agreed with us in the belief of Baptism for remission of sins, for so far as they have expressed themselves to us, they say that if Baptism be for the remission of sins, they have not been Baptised. Notwithstanding, many have left us, our number is not diminished, having been supplied by additions, and our strength is generally increased. Our present number being about forty-three white members who agree with Bro. Thomas, in the octrine concerning life and incorruptibility; several remaining neutral, for whom we cannot answer. We regret to see the division which has or is likely to take place among a people, who profess to have taken the word of God for their faith and practice regardless of the opinions of men in relation to the christian religion; but being more zealous for the cause of truth, than the opinions of men, and being determined to defend it at all hazards, do highly disapprove Bro. Campbell's course in relation to Bro. Thomas, and heartily approve the decision of the Paineville Congregation, as published in the Advocate.

The next thing which claims our attention, is the many evil reports gone abroad concerning the Debate above named. 1st. The report of Mr. Jas. W. Hunicutt is correct concerning the principal subject debated, being "the immaterially or immortality of the Soul," and he has admitted to one of our Brethren, that the balance of his report was principally his conclusions or views drawn from the Debate and Advocate, many of which we say are not true, and call on Mr. Hunnicutt to prove his report if he can, which he says he can do, as published in the Harbinger, and we hereby state that nothing will be admitted as proof but Dr. Thomas' own words, that all may have the priviledge of arriving at their own conclusions; and to prove to Bro. Campbell, that he is the intended victim of this designing Clergyman, we would say to him, that Hunnicutt has been heard to say, that he always entertained a contemptible opinion of him, and more so since his defence of Protestantism in his Debate with Bishop Purcell, and that Dr. Thomas was much more consistent than A. Campbell. 2nd. As regards the report made by Mr. John S. Watt, as published in the Religious Herald, we would not notice, had it not obtained a circulation far beyond the bounds of his acquaintance. Mr. Watt would make the impression on the public mind, that Dr. Thomas was unwilling to discuss the immor-

tality of the Soul, by his not taking up that subject until the evening of the second day of the Debate; which was not the case, for in Mr. Watt's first speech, he threw out many insinuations, or charges in relation to certain things believed by Dr. Thomas, and speaking in relation to the Presbyterians; asked if it was a "new thing for Presbyterians to be liberal?" which made it obligatory on Dr. Thomas to give a History of the Presbyterian Church, in which he shewed it was a new thing that they should be liberal, and called upon Mr. Watt to shew from the Scriptures if he could, whether Presbyterians preached the same Gospel that Paul preached; after having shown from the Scriptures, in connexion with Mr. Watt's text, as recorded in Gal. 1st chap. 8 v., what that Gospel was. From the impatience of Mr. Watt and others, Dr. Thomas was requested to depart from his general order and discuss the subject of immortality, about which Mr. Watt had made so much ado, which he did, and so far from Mr. Watt's "killing the Dr. at one blow," as Bro. Campbell has said; he was entirely unable to answer Dr. Thomas; not occupying his full time in his speech which followed; thereby making the impression on the minds of many, that he would not be able to hold out much longer; but in this opinion they were mistaken; and it was said by a Dr. of Physic, who is a member of the Methodist Society, and opposed to the doctrine maintained by Dr. Thomas; that all the credit he could give Watt, was, that "he could endure more than any man he ever saw, and that all he did, was to tease the Dr."

As to what Mr. Watt has said about the pronunciation of the Hebrew word Naphash, and Dr. Thomas' ignorance of the Hebrew, he acknowledged the explanation given by Dr. Thomas of the pronunciation.

Dr. Thomas did not condescend to notice his knowledge of Hebrew or any other language, but informed Mr. Watt, that he knew enough about the language to prevent being imposed upon by the criticisms of clergymen and others, and could find his own words without the assistance of another, which it is presumable Mr. Watt was not able to do, as his friend searched out his Hebrew words for him, notwithstanding all his puffing with regard to his Hebrew criticisms.

As regards Mr. Watt's accusation, that Dr. Thomas would make the impression on the public mind, that he read from a Hebrew Bible instead of the Lexicon, is untrue, for Mr. Watt urged Dr. Thomas to define the word Soul, which he shewed from the Scriptures, had no absolute meaning, but was dependent on the context. Reading from a Hebrew Lexicon, whose author we do not recollect, showing therefrom the many definitions given that word, informing his audience before reading, that it was a Hebrew Lexicon.

Now, in conclusion of what we have to say, in relation to

the whole matter, is, that we believe, Bro. Thomas scripturally and logically defended all the points discussed during said Debate, making at least 12 or 15 distinct points, which he called on Mr. Watt from day to day, to answer if he could. We leave those who were present to say, whether Mr. Watt met these points or not, and do further say, that we believe Mr. W's object to have been in the communication as published in the Religious Herald, for the purpose of forestalling public opinion with regard to the Debate; and think it exceedingly strange, that he should be able to give a correct account of that which he acknowledged himself unable to do, when called on by Dr. Thomas to write his speeches, in order that they might be published in the forthcoming Debate.

We think it a matter of common justice to all persons, when accused or falsely represented, that they be heard before they are condemned, and hope the Brethren and Friends will suspend their verdict until the evidence is fairly laid before them in the forthcoming Debate:

Signed by order of the Congregation,

WM. A. STONE, } *Elders.*
WM. S. WILSON. }

P. S. We respectfully request that Bro. A. Campbell, Scott, Shepard, Colman, Thomas, and all our editorial Brethren, will publish the above communication in their papers, and that the Editors of the Religious Herald, and Va. and N. C. Conference Journal, as they have given one side of the question, will give it a place in their papers, in order that the friends of Truth and Free Inquiry may have a better opportunity of arriving at correct conclusions concerning said Debate.

WM. A. STONE,
WM. S. WILSON.

CERTIFICATE OF COL. J. G. RICHARDSON.

Bro. Stone, one of the Elders of the Fork Congregation, has also forwarded to me the Certificate of Col. J. G. Richardson of Lunenburg. Before the Debate, the Colonel and myself had no acquaintance. My opponent's second, Dr. Anthony Smith, had the appointing of all the Moderators, of whom Col. R. was one. His certification, therefore, cannot be regarded as the result of an undue bias in my favor. These are his words;—

"I do hereby certify that I was called on to act as a moderator in the late Debate between Mr. John S. Watt and Dr. Thomas, which took place at the Fork Meeting House, in the county of Lunenburg, commencing the first day of August last, and lasted five days. I attended four days, during which time

Dr. Thomas conducted himself with ability and very much like a gentleman. I considered Dr. Thomas fully able to answer any point given him by his opponent, and being called on, I feel it my duty to state that Dr. Thomas complied more strictly with the rules laid down for them to be governed by than Mr. Watt. Given under my hand this 4th March, 1838.

JAMES G. RICHARDSON."

(*Testimony to be continued.*)

Dr. Thomas not a Schismatic, Mr. Campbell himself being Judge.

If divisions, then, are made, it is easy to see who causes them. He that excludes, and not he that is excluded, is the *schismatic* and the *heretic* in Paul's estimation. Offencees will come: for truth is offensive to errorists. Telling the truth to them has caused rivers of human blood to flow. As well, however, might our opponents blame the martyrdom of Jesus, his Apostles, or the first Christians upon themselves, as any division now existing upon us.—*Millennial Harbinger*, p. 5, vol. iii.

Ambition is to the mind, what the cap is to the falcon; it blinds us first, and then compels us to tower, by reason of our blindness. But alas, when we are at the *summit* of a vain ambition, we are also at the *depth* of real misery. We are placed where time cannot improve, but must impair us; where chance and change cannot befriend, but may betray us; in short, by attaining all we wish, and gaining all we want we have only reached a pinnacle, where we have nothing to hope, but every thing to fear.—*Lacon.*

Since our reply to the letter with a double, signature, we have seen another from King and Queen, in which the writer says, that Dr. Thomas' answer to that epistle is to "*decide his fate.*" It may decide our fate with those, who cry peace, peace when there is no peace, but sudden destruction at the door; *they* may cast us out as evil in obedience to the commandments of man: this honor, however, have all the faithful who prefer *light with war* to *darkness with a false peace.* But our "fate," be it known to such, is not in the hands of "dust and ashes," but in the high and righteous keeping of an all-wise, *just*, and Almighty God.

EDITOR.